

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 17, 2006. Claims 1, 2, and 19-21 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-21 remain pending in this case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hoffberg at al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0151992 A1, "Hoffberg").

As noted above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 19-21 to more fully characterize the claimed invention and believes that these claims are allowable as currently written.

As the Examiner is certainly aware, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites:

A memory medium comprising program instructions for specifying a signal analysis function, wherein the memory medium is in a computer system comprising a display, wherein the program instructions are executable to implement:

receiving user input specifying a first operation, wherein the first operation implements at least a portion of a signal analysis function, and wherein the first operation requires an input signal;

automatically analyzing prior operations specified by the user, wherein one or more of the prior operations is operable to generate a respective signal, thereby operating as a signal source, wherein said analyzing the prior operations determines one of the prior operations as an input signal source for the first operation, wherein the input signal source provides a first input signal;

performing the first operation on the first input signal received from the input signal source, wherein said performing produces an output signal;

displaying the output signal on the display; and

performing said automatically analyzing, said performing, and said displaying for each of a plurality of first operations input by the user.

Hoffberg teaches an adaptive interface for predicting a desired user function based on user history and internal machine status, such as for a pattern recognition system. The system of Hoffberg receives an input from the user and presents a predicted input for confirmation by the user, updating the predictive mechanism based on this feedback.

Applicant has amended the independent claim 1 to more fully characterize the disputed terms “operation” and “signal source”. Applicant believes that characterizing the prior operations generating signals and thus operating as a signal source sets forth the definitions of the “operation” and “signal source” elements and will overcome the anticipation objection.

In contrast to Hoffberg, the amended claim 1 presents a system for a user-specified signal analysis function, where the user can specify a first operation, and where the system automatically analyzes prior operations to determine and assign a proper input source for the first operation. The prior operations of claim 1 generate a respective signal, which may be the input signal to the first operation. Specifically, when the user specifies the first operation, the method of claim 1 operates to automatically analyze the prior operations input by the user to determine one of the prior operations as an input source for the first operation. The prior operations operating as signal sources are automatically analyzed to determine that the signal generated by the prior operation can generate a signal for the first operation.

Applicant notes that Hoffberg does not teach to programmatically (i.e., automatically) analyze prior operations input by the user to *determine an input source for the first operation, wherein the input source provides a first input signal*. In fact, Hoffberg fails to disclose programmatic determination of an input source for an input signal. Applicant respectfully notes that in Hoffberg’s system, the sources for data/images/signals are all known, and thus Hoffberg actually teaches away from claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Hoffberg does not disclose each and every element of claim 1 as required by *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH* for an anticipation rejection. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over Hoffberg, and are thus allowable.

Independent claims 19, 20, and 21 include similar limitations as claim 1, and so the above arguments apply with equal force to these claims. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that claims 19, 20, and 21 and those claims respectively dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious, and are thus allowable.

Claim 2

Applicant has also amended dependent claim 2 to more fully characterize the disputed term “data type” of the input signal by amending this term to “signal type” and thus more fully claiming its operation. Applicant believes that characterizing the signal type of the input signal sets forth the definition of the “signal type” element.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the prior art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Applicant respectfully requests removal of the section 102 rejection of claims 1-21.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-82400/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 8/15/2006 JCH/MSW/MRW